

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated May 14, 2009. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the above amendment, claims 12, 13 and 15 are amended; claim 20 is newly presented; and withdrawn claims 1-11, 17 and 19 are cancelled in order to place the present application in condition for allowance. Claim 20 is supported on page 36, lines 13-23 of the specification as originally filed.

1. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised in order to make a number of minor clarifying and other editorial amendments. To facilitate entry of the amendments, a substitute specification and abstract has been prepared. No new matter has been added. Also, a “marked-up” copy of the original specification and abstract are being submitted to show the changes that have been incorporated into the substitute specification and abstract. The copy is entitled “Version with Markings to Show Changes Made.”

2. Drawing Objections

Next, on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the drawings. In response, replacement drawing sheets are submitted herewith in order to label Figs. 8 and 9 as “Prior Art.” As per the Examiner’s request, the brief descriptions of these figures have been amended to reflect that the illustrations are of the prior art. Furthermore, the arrows in Figs. 2 and 3 simply show the transmission of the vacuum generated by the vacuum pump 23. This has been clearly described in the substitute specification. Accordingly, it does not appear necessary to identify the arrows with reference numerals. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the requirement for the additional reference numerals.

3. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, claims 12-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In response, claim 12 has been amended to recite that the removing member moves “relative” to the holding portion.

The Examiner further indicates that the protrusions are “claimed as interfacing with the adhesive region,” and that “this is not in accordance with the earlier sections of the claim.” However, the second paragraph is the first time the protrusions are recited in claim 12. This paragraph recites “*bringing a plurality of protruding portions on a first contact surface of a removing member into contact with a bottom surface of the semiconductor chip through the adhesive sheet at a region on a bottom surface side of the adhesive sheet while sucking and holding a vicinity of the bottom surface-side region of the adhesive sheet corresponding to an adhesion region of the semiconductor chip by a second contact surface of a holding portion located around the first contact surface.*” This paragraph sets forth the location of the first contact surface of the removing member and the location of the second contact surface of the holding portion. The protruding portions contact a bottom surface of the chip through the adhesive sheet. Accordingly, it appears that the description of the protruding protrusions in the second paragraph of claim 12 is accurate and in compliance with the provisions of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. Should the Examiner maintain the position that the recitation of the protruding portions and the adhesive region is unclear, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to work out acceptable claim language.

With regard to claim 13, the forces are differentiated by controlling valves 38 and 39. The force differentiation is supported on page 36, lines 13-23 of the specification as originally filed. Such pressure control by means of the in-line valves is commonly known in the art.

Furthermore, the adhesive sheet above the holes 34 would be held with greater force than the portions of the sheet held by the vacuum applied by the removing portion 21. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 13.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Akira KABESHITA et al.

/Michael S. Huppert/

By 2009.08.14 16:52:14 -04'00'

Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 2005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 14, 2009